

music? The composers are imitating the opera *recit*, its precursor, the *air de cour*, and the faithfulness to text found in the French motet.

It is hoped that an awareness of ties to the text (present or not) will give the modern player a respect for the essentially vocal origins of this music. Definitely, there are organ pieces which mimic instrumental idioms: harpsichord, viola da gamba, trumpet, etc., but they represent only one side of the literature.

NOTES

1. K. G. Fellerer, "Church Music and the Council of Trent," *The Musical Quarterly*, xxxiv (1953), pp. 586-92.
2. Edward Higginbottom, *The Liturgy and French Classical Organ Music*. Dissertation, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 1978, p. 54.
3. Benjamin Van Wyre, "Ritual Use of the Organ in France," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, xxxiii (1980), p. 302.

ORGAN PEDAGOGY AND THE ROMANTIC SPIRIT OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Win. A. Little

The following address was delivered at the Fifth AGO National Conference on Organ Pedagogy in Worcester, Mass., June 24, 1990.

At first or second glance, or even at tenth or 15th glance, the threads that bind organ pedagogy to the Romantic Spirit of the 19th century seem tenuous at best. Neither the Kantian imperatives nor Hegel's theses and antitheses would appear, even to the informed observer, to have more than the most limited application in illuminating the mysteries of heel-toe pedaling, legato touch, or cross-bar phrasing. In truth, of course, even the closest scrutiny will fail to reveal the presence of a relationship where none inherently exists.

On the other hand, so pervasive was the Romantic Spirit in the 19th century that it is not unreasonable to think that even organ pedagogy should have remained unaffected by it. In the first place, music lay at the very core of Romanticism, with scored music as its pulse beat. Music was the great universal religion of the Romantics, and the musician its appointed priest. Why then should any aspect of an art so integrally bound up with the spirit of its time be immune to its influence? Clearly, it should not, and consequently I think it may be worthwhile to explore, if only briefly, the impact of the Romantic Spirit on organ pedagogy: first, to determine in what ways it manifested itself; secondly, to see how it affected the development of the literature for the instrument; and, thirdly, to ascertain whether any lessons may be drawn from these matters which might serve a useful purpose today.

Among the many innovative phenomena which mark the latter half of the 18th century, one had direct and far-reaching implications for the development of organ music in the 19th century. Specifically, I have in mind the startling increase in the number of musical textbooks and tutors published between 1750 and 1800. On the face of it there was nothing new or novel about textbooks as such, and certainly there was no scarcity of them in the early years of the 18th century. Nonetheless, in the Golden Age of Reason and the Enlightenment, with their emphasis on progress and their faith in the

perfectibility of man, it could reasonably be expected that the textbook would play a particularly vital role as a didactic vehicle. And so it did, but here a distinction should be made between textbook and tutor, although this distinction became marked only at a somewhat later time.

On the one hand, the authors of the theoretical texts—whether Kircher in the 17th century or Kimberger in the 18th—could presume a relatively sophisticated audience for their works: counterpoint and composition are academic disciplines, where mastery is developed through intellectual endeavor, by learning and applying certain fundamental rules and principles.

The practical tutors, on the other hand, were written for those who wanted to learn to perform, and consequently their authors had to direct themselves to an audience sometimes radically different in its musical and intellectual orientation. The principal aim of the tutors was to show how rather than why, and in both style and language they were governed by the need to be clear and direct.

Between 1737 and 1784 Michel Corrette, the French organist and composer, produced some 17 tutors for an entire galaxy of instruments, from the harpsichord to the hurdy-gurdy, from the violin and guitar to the flûte à bec.

In Germany no similar single figure dominated the field, but several of the authors of instrumental tutors were among the most distinguished musicians of the day. The appearance of not one, but several major tutors, all within the space of about a decade in mid-century was wholly without parallel. Simply to cite the most eminent, there was Marpurg's method for the clavichord in 1750, Quantz's method for the flute in 1752, C.P.E. Bach's treatise on the clavichord in 1753 and 1762, and Leopold Mozart's *Violinschule* in 1756. Only a few years later, in 1770, Altenburg wrote his great *Musikalisches Trompeter- und Paukenkunst*. Roughly equal in importance were Daniel Gottlob Türk's book, *On the Most Important Duties of an Organist*, published in 1787, and his *Clavierschule*, in 1789, both of which have been recently translated.¹ Altogether, the number and quality of instrumental tutors that appeared in Germany in the second half

4. Yvonne Rokseth, *La musique d'orgue au XVIII^e siècle et au début du XIX^e siècle*. Dissertation, University of Paris, 1930, p. 166.

5. G.-G. Nivers, *Dissertation sur le chœur grégorien*, date (?), p. 114.

6. Tielouze, preface to *Hymnes de l'Église*, 1823, p. 5. "... lesquelles parties l'on pourroit, non seulement extraire, mais aussi les chanter parce qu'ils ont leur chants distingués..."

7. Discussed in Mario Tielie's article, "Renaissance and Baroque Musical Instruments and Their Pronunciation," *The Organ Yearbook* 15: 1984.

8. As quoted in Gustave Reese, *Music in the Renaissance*, rev. ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1959), p. 378.

9. Albert Cohen, "A Study of Notational and Performance Problems of an Early Air de cour, *Je voudrais bien, 6 Clois* (1629) by Antoine Boësset (c. 1586-1643)," *Notations and Editions: A Book in Honor of Louise Culter*, ed. Edith Borroff (Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publ., 1974), p. 55.

10. Dennis Launay, *Anthologie du Motet Latin* (1609-1661). Publications de la Société française de musicologie, first series, xvii (1963).

of the 18th century was as amazing as it was unprecedented.

What had hitherto been the closely guarded terrain of professionals, who passed on the secrets of their skills in a carefully structured relationship, was now thrown open and revealed in minute detail for anyone who wanted to learn to play an instrument and had the money to purchase the book. This development may have represented an intent to broaden the base of musical activity in the general cultural life of the time, but it also clearly represented a breakdown in the venerable Guild system, according to which the admission of candidates was highly selective and the initiation process rigorously controlled. More to the point, however, it constituted a tacit acknowledgment that the artist-performer was no longer the privileged possessor of arcane truths.

Given the magnitude of this pedagogical shift, it is only natural to try to determine what caused it.

In the commentary to his facsimile-reprint edition of Türk's *Duties of an Organist*, Bernard Billetter offers one plausible explanation which might account for the organ tutors, but which does not apply in broader terms. Based on the premise that the second half of the 18th century was an era of general deterioration in the field of church music, he argues that it is "most often in these periods of decay that the significant textbooks are written, since oral instruction suffices during a time of prosperity, and only important principles are codified. But when good teachers and models become rare, the need arises for the transmission of even the most self-understood details."²

Billetter's assessment of the situation in church music in the latter half of the 18th century is certainly on the mark, but the preponderance of instrumental tutors that appeared during those years were for instruments other than the organ—there were, in fact, no more than a half dozen or so organ tutors recorded in the entire period. Equally, if not more important, the world of music, otherwise, flourished during the second half of the century: the works of Gluck, Haydn, Mozart, and countless other composers testify to the health and prosperity of secular music during these decades.

In truth, the appearance of these numerous tutors was part of a larger pan-European cultural pattern in the latter part of the century, with its powerful dual emphasis on the systemization of knowledge and on the development of cogent educational principles.

Never before in the history of Western civilization had so much energy been expended on assimilating and systematizing the vast totality of human knowledge. This was the era of the great encyclopedists, not only in France, but also in Germany and England. The great French *Encyclopédie* in 34 volumes (1751-80) involved some of the greatest minds of the age. It was dwarfed, however, by its two German counterparts: Zedler's *Lexikon* ran to 68 volumes (1732-54), but even it was eclipsed by J.G. Krutitz's *Universal-Lexikon*, which at final count came to a colossal 242 volumes. (I might add here that both German encyclopedias are mines of information, still virtually untapped by either musicologists or organ historians.) Finally, in England the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* began to appear in 1768, and only a few years earlier, in 1755, Dr. Johnson had completed his *Dictionary of the English Language*.

While the encyclopedists were laboring to compile their lexicographical monuments, a number of other major European thinkers were pondering educational reforms that would be commensurate with the advances being made in science and technology. In France Jean Jacques Rousseau's *Émile ou de l'éducation* (1762) was a landmark work, and in Germany the foremost spokesman for new directions in education was Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, who lived and wrote well into the 18th century (he died only a month before Beethoven, in 1827).

During the final years of the 18th century one further movement began to circulate in the European literary and artistic community. Romanticism was both the outgrowth of rationalism or classicism and simultaneously a clear reaction against it. The lines of demarcation between the two, if they can be said to exist at all, are impenetrably murky. Yet even as the Romantic Spirit spread across Europe, even as it became the dominant aesthetic force on the continent, it continued to defy any precise definition.

Nevertheless, scholars have spent the better part of a century and a half in attempts to formulate a definition, all with more or less varying degrees of failure. Be that as it may, I think there are one or two characteristics of Romanticism that are generally present and particularly relevant to today's topic. Specifically, Romanticism was marked by an infinite longing or yearning, which had no specific goal or object. In many ways it was an infinite longing for the Infinite. Throughout the movement there was a continuous striving after the ineffable, symbolized by the vague wistful longing for the elusive blue flower. The clear boundaries of time and space melted and became obscured as the Romantics yearned for distant ages and remote climes.

"Out of such concepts grew the emphasis on education. In the Romantic sense this meant the development of all innate faculties in an approach to infinite perfection."³ In the words of the *Athenäum*, the quasi-official organ of the Romantic movement, "Only through education (*Bildung*) does man become truly human, since education represents an attempt at encompassing the totality of human experience."⁴

Thus by the turn of the 19th century the various key pieces were in place: the systemization of knowledge, the growing concern with both the practical and spiritual education of man, and the longing to become part of the infinite universal experience. All these now combined to shape the development of the new century in almost every facet of existence, not only including music, but especially music.

The low estate into which organ and church music had fallen after the death of Bach was recognized by a number of contemporary writers, but it was not until very late in the century that men like Voigt, Türk, or Knecht actually began to do anything to remedy the situation.

Between 1795 and 1798, Justin Heinrich Knecht published his *Vollständige Orgelschule*, a work aimed primarily at improving organ performance skills. Whereas Türk, in his *Duties of an Organist* had been motivated by evangelistic concerns, Knecht's concerns were entirely practical, and his *Vollständige Orgelschule* still stands as one of the great milestones in the history of organ pedagogy.⁵

Whatever one may think of Knecht as an aesthetician or composer—and his published organ works do not suggest that he was more than a mediocre talent—his *Orgelschule* deserves credit as the first comprehensive method for the organ. To be sure, Knecht had predecessors, such as Sämber, Sonnenkalb, Prixner, the *Wegweiser* (Speh?), and a number of others, but all of them had more or less existed in a vacuum, and none of them, with the exception of Sämber, demonstrated anything more than the most modest of pretensions. Knecht, however, was a product of the encyclopedist generation, and his intent was to furnish a vast six-part pedagogical treatise which might legitimately take its place beside Dom Bédos's *L'Art du facteur d'orgues*. In large measure he succeeded.

Emphatically serious in tone, panoramic in scope, and illustrated with hundreds of examples and exercises, the three published parts of the *Orgelschule* (all that Knecht completed) lead the student step by step to a level of considerable virtuosity. Unlike many authors of organ methods Knecht presumes a relatively advanced keyboard technique even in the beginning organ student. Knecht provides a lengthy discussion and numerous exercises for the three modes of pedaling: all toe (the "natural" mode), alternate toe-heel for each foot, above and below pedal C, respectively (the "artful"/*kunstvolle* mode), and the use of toe-heel, and libidum (called the "mixed" mode).⁶ Having dwelt on these approaches in some detail (we are told that Abbé Vogler preferred the "artful" mode), Knecht concludes—and this is 1795—that the last of the three is the preferred mode—a decision in which most of Knecht's major successors in the 19th century concurred.⁷ It is also worth noting that Türk, writing ten years earlier—in 1787—had also unequivocally recommended the "mixed" mode of toe-heel.

Knecht is tireless in his discussions, not only of pedaling, but of fingering, phrasing, articulation, and registration. He also devotes considerable space to questions of plainsong and Protestant hymnody, and he supplies specifications for a number of major European organs. Among his musical examples he includes numerous chorales and

plainchant settings, but for the most part his examples consist of secular movements: rondos, adagios, and cantabiles. There is also both an oboe and a flute concerto (rather persuasive evidence of Türk's familiarity with Knecht's work). All in all, Knecht provided his contemporaries with a massive volume of information that could be had nowhere else at the time from a single source. Even today Knecht's *Orgelschule* remains invaluable as a primary source for students and scholars alike.

Between publication of the final volume of Knecht's work in 1798 and the appearance of the first volume of Kittel's *Angenhender praktischer Organist* in 1801 lay a space of only three years, but the two works are radically different in every way. Knecht, with his cool detached style and his focus on performance, represents the final expression of 18th-century pedagogical thought about the organ. And although the third part of his work is devoted to treatment of chorale and plainsong, the focus of the work as a whole is on the development of the technically skilled performer.

Not so with Kittel, for whom the education of the church musician constitutes something of a sacred trust, and for whom the chorale and its treatment stand at the center of all matters relative to the organ. Such exotica as rondos or flute concertos would have horrified Kittel, who ventured only warily into the perilous waters of the *stylus fantasticus*. In short, Knecht remained firmly anchored in the 18th-century traditions of the Enlightenment while Kittel exuded in his own rather primitive way the budding Romantic Spirit.

The first decade of the 19th-century—during which Kittel's work appeared—was one of profound upheaval in Europe: Napoleon's armies marched across the continent, and in the course of various victories and defeats the Holy Roman Empire itself finally came to an inglorious end. These were not good years for the average citizen, and they were particularly difficult for the church musician. Years of neglect and frequently aggressive indifference had eroded the organist's standing and integrity, both within the musical fraternity and the community at large. With little organ music permitted beyond introducing, interluding, and accompanying the chorale, younger musicians saw little point in devoting their lives to an instrument and profession for which there was little use and less respect. And now in wartime the very churches themselves were routinely usurped for barracks, stables, or munitions warehouses. Even Kittel's church in Erfurt was requisitioned for two years for the storage of hay.

Clearly, Kittel's *Angenhender praktischer Organist* was dictated by a deep concern for the profession. It is, however, not actually a tutor in the traditional sense of the word, but rather a loosely structured articulation of the author's musical program. Conversational in tone and leisurely to the point of distraction, Kittel cajoles his readers; he exhorts them "to study Nature, because Nature is the mother of art. . . . Surrender your whole being to the impressions of the beauties of Nature around you, and dare to decipher the secret laws, according to which this great Mistress has reigned for eleanthes in the essence of things."⁸ Despite the breathless prose, Kittel remains resolutely silent about what specific practical benefits are to be derived from such study. (Doubt-

less, to raise such questions would have struck him as caviling.) He perceives the organist's role as a kind of holy calling, "no less important than that of the preacher (1.4)." For Charles Brown—in a recent dissertation on Kittel's tutor—and presumably for most readers who have seriously engaged the text, it is "neither practical nor basic, [but rather an appeal] to the organist's emotions—his soul, as it were. . . [in which Kittel sets] a new tone of idealism."¹⁹

Sounding this eager tone of idealism, Kittel makes an impassioned and historic call for "assistance from above,"²⁰ by which he means the government, on whom he calls for the establishment of public institutions for the training of organists and cantors.

Kittel's call for help was echoed by others in various parts of Germany, who recognized the plight of church music and made similar appeals. In Prussia, Wilhelm von Humboldt and Carl Zelter urged the king to establish schools specifically to train organists and church musicians, and in the second decade of the new century a number of such schools were finally set up. In his now famous decree King Friedrich Wilhelm III announced that the time had come—after the ravages of war—for the state to "replace through spiritual powers, what it had lost in physical powers."²¹

At last the tide was beginning to turn, and in 1822 the Royal Academic Institute for Church Music was established in Berlin. It was the first permanent institute of its kind in Germany to be supported by state funds.²² The training of church musicians now moved from the private or religious sector into the civil sector, and one further link was forged in the chain that bound church and state. It also represented the next important step from the systemization of learning to its institutionalization.

During the first two years of its existence the Institute was headed by Zelter, who was also director of the Berliner Singakademie and Mendelssohn's teacher for theory, counterpoint, and composition. On Zelter's death in 1832 the directorship passed into the hands of August Wilhelm Bach, Berlin's leading organist, and organ teacher of Mendelssohn, Carl August Haupt, and many others.²³

Under Bach's direction and that of his successor, August Haupt, the institute attracted organ students from all over Europe, England, and the United States. Among Haupt's German students were Otto Nicolai (1828), Ludwig Thiele (1831), Otto Diemel (1863), and Wilhelm Middelschulte (1886), and some of his more prominent American students were John Knowles Paine, Philip Hale, Charles Converse, and Clarence Eddy.

At precisely the same time that final details were being worked out for the Royal Institute for Church Music in 1821, another movement was set in motion which would deeply influence the course of piano and organ pedagogy through the remainder of the century. At Zelter's recommendation, the Prussian government invited the famous but controversial piano pedagogue, Johann Bernhard Logier, to come to Berlin, and under a royal appointment he taught there, using his *Method* from 1822 to 1826.

Logier's appearance on the pedagogical scene was hardly surprising: it represented yet one further manifestation of the broad Romantic wish to integrate the arts through methodology. In the early years of the century, with its rapid technological advances,

Logier's method had a particular appeal, since it employed technological means to achieve artistic ends. The fascination of the Romantics with new methodologies and their potentials spread across Europe like an epidemic; as Arnold Schering noted, "a methodological fever had taken over Paris."²⁴ In the teens and twenties he might equally well have said the same about Berlin.

Logier perceived and exploited the two great pedagogical weaknesses of his time: the boundless Romantic infatuation with virtuoso technique and the idolization of prodigies.²⁵ To achieve his goals Logier devised the *chiroplast*, a mechanism used to guide the fingers. Secondly, he adopted a plan involving simultaneous instruction, whereby several pupils played, each at his own instrument as part of a classroom program. In sum, Logier claimed that he could transform even "a retarded child" (*ein geistesschwaches Kind*) into a virtuoso.

It was an age of naive beliefs and well-nigh infinite credulity. An era that could acclaim Franz Mesmer and Phineas T. Barnum obviously had little difficulty in accepting Logier. Spohr was entirely taken in, and so for a time was Friedrich Wieck (Clara Schumann's father). Such doubters as Ignaz Moschelles and Franz Liszt (who sarcastically called the "guide de main" the "guide-âne") were distinctly in the minority.

Operating under royal aegis, Logier's success in Berlin was assured. Moreover, his students from elsewhere in Germany regularly promoted his methodology when they returned home, and thus his influence spread throughout the country. As Schering put it, "During the third decade of the century the country was wholly under the influence of his reforms and during the fourth decade it was predominantly so."²⁶ So thoroughly did Logier's system dominate German piano pedagogy in the first half of the 19th century, that Gustav Schilling in his *Universal-Lexikon der Tonkunst* (1835-37/1849) could refer to it as a "Nationalsystem."²⁷

One of Logier's Berlin students, the organist Carl Freudenberg, opened one of the more successful Logier schools in Breslau in 1823, but when he looked back on it in his memoirs nearly a half century later, a note of sober reality seems to have crept in, "After four months of instruction we received our teaching certificates which empowered us to go forth into the world and—in keeping with Logier's Method—to straw plenty of sand in people's eyes."²⁸

Even given the success of Freudenberg and his Breslau school, it was overshadowed by the pedagogical achievements of Johann Friedrich Schneider and the school he founded in Dessau in 1829, also based on Logier's principles. One of the most prominent schools of its kind in Germany, it attracted a host of gifted students, and until it closed its doors in 1846 it remained under Schneider's innovative but autocratic direction. Before settling in Dessau Schneider had established his reputation as organist of the Thomas-Kirche and municipal director of music in Leipzig. His *Handbuch des Organisten*, published in 1829-30, remains one of the outstanding pedagogical texts of the century.²⁹

Unlike Kittel or Rinck, who, except in their musical training, were largely autodidacts, Schneider's outlook was sophisticated and academically informed. He was

also a member of a distinguished family of musicians and organists; his brother, Johann Gottlieb, was organist of the Sophien-Kirche in Dresden and one of the great virtuosos and organ teachers of his time. Friedrich Schneider himself was equally at home in either church or theater. Consequently, it is not surprising that his *Organ Method* is not, like those of so many of his predecessors, myopically focused on the treatment of the chorale. By no means does he neglect the chorale, but for the first time among the tutors Schneider takes a genuinely balanced position in his discussion of it.

In and of itself, this point reflects one of the important changes taking place in Germany in the sphere of church music and thus of organ pedagogy. Gradually, but only gradually, greater latitude was being restored to the role of the organ within the context of worship. From a contemporary viewpoint the process moved at a glacially slow pace, but with the perspective of a century and a half it is clearly discernible.

Returning for a moment to the chorale, Schneider gives lie to Frotscher, who in his *History of Organ Playing* maintains that the organist of the Romantic period viewed as his task the portrayal of the chorale in "musikalischer Materie!" or "musical painting."³⁰ Not so, says Schneider, who confronts the issue head-on, "The organist is not to attempt to paint (as it were) what has been sung in the line just finished or about to commence; for example, to whimper in semitones at the word sorrowful; or when thunder is mentioned to storm away with unisons . . . that would be utterly ridiculous; such painting is of no use whatever; the sentiment is the object: the organist must make his entire playing conformable in every respect to the leading sentiment expressed."³⁰ Interestingly enough, Rinck asserts almost verbatim that some point in the third part of his *Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung zum Orgelspielen* of 1839:³¹

In practical terms Schneider discusses the three modes of pedaling and provides exercises for each, but, like Knecht, he concludes that "the mixed method, which always selects according to circumstances from each particular one that which is most appropriate, is the best."³²

Schneider also discusses in some detail the technique for substitution, in both manuals and pedals, in order to produce a smooth and continuous legato, "the principal thing to be attended to is that the progression of each single part be not injured in its connection, therefore in fingering special care must be taken that this be not lost sight of; this is properly speaking the first principle."³³—All this was some 30 years before Lemmens's *École d'orgue*, and certainly Schneider was not the first to argue the case.

One final point, regarding Schneider, since it is endemic to virtually all tutors of the period. Simultaneously, it is also one of the central issues that distinguishes the organist of the Romantic era from the organist of Bach's time: namely the relationship of the performer to his instrument and the relationship of the performer to his audience.

For Bach and his contemporaries the organ was an instrument dedicated to God, and the organist's performance or his interpretation of a chorale represented an expression of faith, articulated in musical terms. In the Romantic era, however, that relationship between artist and divinity shifted signifi-

cantly. It was now the task of the organist, as Kittel and other organ pedagogues put it, "to speak to the hearts and intellects of those present, not with words but with musical sounds. . . . The organist should endeavor to prepare, maintain, and fix this serious mood in the souls of those present."²⁴ Schneider, Rinck, and others take essentially the same stance. It is now seen as the organist's duty to establish and maintain a relationship with his audience, whereas earlier the organist's relationship had been exclusively with God. Thus the change was a radical one: from a theocentrically oriented position in the 18th century to an anthropocentric position in the 19th. And now, as the performer seeks to edify and to be evocative, he further runs the risk of transforming the organ into a utilitarian instrument.

Schneider's *Handbook* is one of the most reasoned and lucid of the tutors that appeared in the first half century, a period in which the appearance of organ tutors grew from a trickle to a torrent—as can be seen from the appended list.

Certainly no organ pedagogue of the Romantic era was a more committed exponent of his art than Johann Christian Heinrich Rinck. Nor did the work of any other writer so clearly dominate the field of organ pedagogy in the first half century as did Rinck. Rising from the most humble beginnings, he gradually attained—more through industry than genius—a position of remarkable eminence in the organ world. An indefatigable writer, driven simultaneously by ambition and necessity, he unfortunately produced far more than his native gifts could sustain. Nonetheless, there is plenty of wheat among the chaff, and the place he occupies in 19th-century organ music is both deserved and assured.

Between 1819 and 1839 Rinck wrote a total of four tutors that together propelled him into the forefront of organ pedagogy, not only in Germany, but in France and England as well. The first of his didactic works was the *Praktische Orgelschule* (Op. 55), published between 1819 and 1821. This was followed by his *Vorschule für angehende Organisten* (Op. 82) in 1827, then the *First Three Months at the Organ* (Op. 121, 1838), and finally, the *Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung zum Orgelspielen* (Op. 124), which began to appear the same year (through the manuscript had been completed in 1832).

Of all four tutors it was the first that won him greatest fame. It was translated into French in 1828, and in 1835 Samuel Wesley translated it into English (though I have never succeeded in locating a copy). Later in the century W.T. Best brought out an edition, which became the standard English text.

Looking at the *Praktische Orgelschule* one wonders why this particular tutor over all others gained such wide and lasting acceptance. There are, I think, several reasons, but let me cite only three: first, the *Praktische Orgelschule* was Rinck's Opus 55; he had been publishing his organ works since 1794—a full quarter century; he was already recognized as a teacher and as a composer of organ music that was attractive and lay within the technical capacity of a large body of relatively unskilled players. Secondly, through his teacher, Kittel, he claimed apostolic succession to J.S. Bach, which certainly enhanced his public and professional image—though by 1819 the potency of that heritage had been hopelessly diluted. The

third reason why the *Praktische Orgelschule* may have succeeded where others didn't lies, I think, in Rinck's uncharacteristic reticence. Quite simply, it was not worthy; where others succumbed to an alleged German inclination to prolixity, Rinck did not, which meant that his text could be used adjunctively by any teacher of whatever pedagogical persuasion. Moreover, his exercises were appropriate and his exemplars pleasing. One measure of Rinck's popularity can be had by glancing at the list of subscribers for his final work, the *Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung*. A total of 544 people subscribed to a staggering total of 967 copies. By any standards that makes it a best-seller and undoubtedly an achievement no other organ tutor before or probably since could match.

Unfortunately and curiously, the *Anleitung* is much less known today than the *Praktische Orgelschule*. One wishes it might be the other way around. Where the *Orgelschule* had been reserved, the *Anleitung* is expansive, and it contains a wealth of informative material. Indeed, it is one of the most comprehensive sourcebooks for 19th-century organ performance practices that I know. It also contains some of Rinck's most ingenious studies—including a remarkable set of 17 variations on the C-major scale.

In the course of his long career Rinck attracted a multitude of students, and a number of them, such as Julius Katterfeldt, Georg Vierling, and Friedrich Kühnstedt, went on to distinguish themselves in the field of church music. Adolf Friedrich Hesse also made the pilgrimage to Darmstadt in October 1828, but he studied with Rinck for only five months—he was 19 at the time.

Rinck was unquestionably one of the leading *Organistenmacher* of his time; he was also one of the last who was not associated with a specific institute or conservatory. As a teacher, Rinck's prime concern was with the training of church musicians, of competent but not virtuoso organists. Gradually, however, with the ascendancy of music conservatories, the emphasis came more and more to be placed on developing virtuoso performers.

The first conservatory in Germany opened in Leipzig in April 1843. It was the brainchild of Felix Mendelssohn, and he served as its unnamed director through its formative years. Very shortly after Leipzig, conservatories were also established in other major urban centers such as Munich, Berlin, Dresden, and Frankfurt. The conservatories never replaced the church music institutes; it was never intended that they should; their goals were essentially different, and they attracted a different student body.

The impact of the conservatories on organ studies was both considerable and far-reaching. In the first place the conservatory was a wholly secular institution, founded and funded by the state. That the first conservatory in Germany was nurtured into being by Mendelssohn was entirely in keeping with the composer's character and outlook, since first and foremost, he was a secular musician. At the same time, however, he was also an organist of virtuoso caliber. Thus the seeds for the secularization of organ studies were planted early and deep in the German conservatory system.

One of the great advantages of the conservatories was that the organists of this new generation were once again assimilated into the larger fraternity of musicians. While the

emphasis may still have been, of necessity, on preparation for a career in church music, the conservatory program exposed the student to a variety of teachers, and consequently to a healthy diversity of opinion and approach. Again, it represented the Romantic emphasis on artistic and social integration. Still more important, the young organist was now thrown into close interaction with other instrumentalists: pianists, violinists, flutists, all roughly of the same age, all working toward a professional career in performance, and all competing to acquire technical brilliance.

Germany in the 1830s and '40s was awash with virtuosos. Pianists such as Liszt, Chopin, Thalberg, Taubig, Kalkbrenner, and a raft of others regularly filled the concert halls of all the major German cities. The drive for virtuosity was in the air—it was everywhere. Small wonder then, that organists too were emboldened to take up the challenge. Small wonder, also, that as organists developed virtuoso techniques, composers kept up by supplying a whole new literature for the instrument that was both artistically reputable and technically demanding. Liszt's *Ad nos* was written in 1850, his *B-A-C-H* in 1855, and Reubke completed his *Sonata* on the 94th Psalm in the spring of 1857. Just eleven years earlier, Rinck had died. Measured in musical terms, the two events happened light years apart.

From the very outset the German conservatories attracted a highly gifted and highly motivated international student body. George Babcock of Boston, son of the piano builder, Alpheus Babcock, was enrolled in the first class of the Leipzig Conservatory when it opened in 1843, and 15 years later Arthur Sullivan and Dudley Buck were classmates in the class of 1858. This example illustrates in nice one of the most significant contributions of the German conservatories: throughout the century they served as pedagogical meccas for musicians from around the world. They also served to bring American musicians, including organists, into the mainstream of European musical thought and practice. With rare exceptions until about 1840 the musical traffic between England, Europe, and the United States had been one-way. From about mid-century onward, however, traffic began to move in the opposite direction, as more and more American musicians decided to get their musical training firsthand from Europe's best teachers.

In practical terms native American musicians, whether organists, pianists, or violinists, were now forced to compete with Europe's most talented, with the result that American musical standards rose dramatically, in order to align themselves with European standards.

Secondly, the German conservatories became the models for the new American conservatories that sprang up from the 1860s onward. A glance at Matthews's *Hundred Years of Music in America*²⁵ more than confirms the indebtedness of American conservatories to German models.

The practice of music, specifically organ music, in the 19th century from Rinck to Reger underwent a series of dramatic changes. Between the unpretentious homophonic efforts of Kittel, Rinck, and Co., and the cyclopean contrapuntal fantasies of Reger lay a period in which the ground rules of both theory and performance were in constant flux. Though we tend to play 19th-

century German organ music today with relative confidence, the substructure on which that confidence rests may be less secure than we might imagine. Schneider, Töpfer, and Ritter all represent somewhat different approaches, and Lemmens is often at odds with all of them. Yet there is a frequent tendency both here and abroad to play Mendelssohn as if it were early Widor. The important point is that studies in organ performance practice in the 19th century are still in their infancy. For the turn of 20th century there are yet a few who can speak with firsthand knowledge of their work with Reger or Straube, but that will not long be the case. While still possible, these remaining voices of our collective memory should be systematically and exhaustively interviewed and videotaped.

For the earlier part of the century and before, we must rely primarily on the organ tutors. And here, the abundance of 19th-century organ tutors is certainly one of the richest blessings that age could have left us—and one that urgently needs to be explored. Here vast repositories of information still await even the most superficial examination. Such standard texts as Kittel's *Angewandter praktischer Organist* or Rinck's *Praktische Orgelschule* have long since yielded up the bulk of their substance; they have become shibboleths of the profession.

These other tutors, however, constitute the still unexplored terrain of 19th-century organ pedagogy. Here the potential for new knowledge and understanding lies everywhere at hand. Here original research not only holds out the promise of fresh insights, it also affords the opportunity to participate in that never-ending quest for knowledge that ultimately lies at the heart of the Romantic Spirit.

NOTES

1. Daniel Gottlob Türk, *School of Clavier Playing*, trans. with introduction and commentary by Raymond H. Hagg (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1982); Margot Woodard, "Concerning the Clavier Responsibilities of an Organist," *Dissertation*, University of Nebraska, 1987.
2. D.G. Türk, *Von der wichtigsten Pflichten eines Organisten* (Halle, 1787). Facsimile reprint with notes and postscript by Bernhard Billeter. *Biblitheca Organologica*, V (Hilversum: Frits Knuf, 1966), p. 1.
3. John C. Blankenagel, "The Dominant Characteristics of German Romanticism," *PMLA* 1v, 1 (March 1940), p. 6.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Justin Heinrich Knecht, *Vollständige Orgelschule für Anfänger und Geübtere* (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1795-98). Facsimile reprint, ed. Martin Ladenburger (Weisbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1969).
6. *Ibid.*, I, p. 43-53. The terms "natural" or "simple" (*natrürlich* or *einfacl*), "artful" or "artificial" (*kunstvoll* or *kunstlich*), and "mixed" (*vermischt*) were not used by Knecht (nor by Kittel or J.G. Werner [?1]). Nonetheless, these designations seem to have originated about the turn of the century and were in common use by the time of Rinck and Schneider. Peter Kraus (Wechselspielchen [Weisbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1974], p. 106) implies—incorrectly—that Türk ("p. 58 [*sic*]"), actually p. 158) used these terms in his *Dubos of an Organist* (1787).
7. Most prominent of those who differed from this position was Friedrich Wilhelm Schütze (#61), whose text remained in print for at least a half century. Schütze advocated the use of all loses as "the most natural, simple, and certain" of the various modes [*Handbuch zu der praktischen Orgelschule*, Leipzig: Arnold, 1858], p. 63).
8. Johann Christian Kittel, *Der angehende praktische Organist* (Erfurt: Beyer & Marting, 1801), I, p.

6. "Übergieb da Dein ganzes Wesen den Eindrücken der schönen Natur um Dich her und wage es die geheimnisvollen Gesetze zu entziffern, nach welchen diese große Meisterin seit Ewigkeiten in dem Wesen der Dinge walte."

9. Charles S. Brown, "The Art of Choralale-Predning and Choral Accompaniment as Presented in Kittel's *Der angehende praktische Organist*," *Dissertation*, Eastman School of Music, 1970, pp. v, vi.
 10. Kittel, III, p. 95.
 11. Max Schipke, "Geschichte des Akademischen Instituts für Kirchenmusik in Berlin," *Festschrift zur Feier des hundertjährigen Bestehens der staatlichen Akademie für Kirchenmusik in Berlin* (Berlin, 1922), p. 7.
 12. Josef Müller-Blattau, "Über Erziehung, Bildung und Fortbildung der Organisten," *Bericht über die Freiburger Tagung für Deutsche Orgelkunst vom 27. bis 30. Juli 1926*, ed. W. Gurth (Leipzig, Kassel: Batemannverlag, 1923), p. 105.
 13. August Wilhelm Bach (1796-1869) never claimed relationship to J.S. Bach, and at most he may have been collaterally related to the Thüringian Bach family.
 14. Arnold Schering, "Das öffentliche Musikschulwesen in Deutschland bis zur Gründung des Leipziger Konservatoriums," *Festschrift zum 75-jährigen Bestehen des königlichen Konservatoriums der Musik zu Leipzig* (Leipzig: Siegel, 1918), p. 71.
 15. *Ibid.*
 16. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
 17. Carl Freudenberg, *Aus dem Leben eines alten Organisten* (Leipzig: Jenckert, 1872?), p. 30.
 18. Friedrich Schneider, *Handbuch des Organisten* (Leipzig: Hofmeister, 1829/30), #57; *Theoretisch und Praktisch Instruction für den Organ*, trans. Charles Flaxman (London: Novello, 1837).
 19. Gotthold Protscher, *Geschichte des Orgelspiels und der Orgelkomposition* (Berlin-Schöneberg: Hesse, 1936), II, p. 1127.
 20. Schneider/Flaxman, p. 77. Flaxman's translation slightly paraphrased here.
 21. Johann Christian Heinrich Rinck, *Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung zum Orgelspiel* (Darmstadt: Diehl, 1839), III, p. 2. "Bei dem Bestreben, den Choral mit Ausdruck zu spielen, hat jedoch der Organist sich sorgfältig vor aller musikalischen Malerei zu hüten" (In his endeavor to play the chorale with expression, the organist must be particularly on his guard to avoid all musical painting!).
 22. Schneider/Flaxman, p. 53. By Rinck's and Schneider's time these terms had become accepted parlance. See footnote 6. Flaxman translates, using the English term "artificial," which is slightly less felicitous than "artful."
 23. *Ibid.*, p. 14. Schneider's italics.
 24. Kittel, I, p. 4. Brown's translation (p. 48). See also footnote 9.
 25. A Hundred Years of Music in America, ed. W.S.B. Matthews (Chicago: Howe, 1889), especially chapter XVIII, pp. 430-48. "Institutions for the Higher Musical Education."
- Unless otherwise noted, all translations from the German are my own.

ORGAN TUTORS AND PEDAGOGICAL HANDBOOKS

A Preliminary Checklist

The following list was developed from a bibliography compiled by Michael Schneider and published in his *Die Orgelspieltechnik des 19ten Jahrhunderts in Deutschland* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1941). It has been revised, expanded, and updated several times, most recently in June 1990. Nevertheless, it does not pretend to completeness, nor, at this stage, total accuracy. German publication records for musical scores and tutors prior to 1910 are notoriously sketchy. Even such standard reference tools as *Whistling*, *Hofmeister*, etc., made little pretense at inclusivity, but were quite selective about what they chose to include in their annual bibliographies. Moreover, organ tutors, like school texts, were generally regarded as ephemera; once their usefulness had been outlived, they were discarded. Consequently, the serious dearth of original tutors that have survived.

Any information regarding tutors not included in this list, or identification of errors, or any information on the whereabouts of tutors (other than the most familiar) cited in this list would be most welcome and greatly appreciated.

1. Anding, J.M. *Handbuehlein für angehende Orgelspieler und solche, die es werden wollen*. Hildburghausen, 1853.
2. André, Julius. *Theoretisch-praktische Orgelschule*, 3 parts. Offenbach: André, 1845; c. 1856.
3. _____, *Kurzgefasste theoretisch-praktische Orgelschule*, Op. 25. Offenbach: André (German and English text).
4. _____, *Anleitung zum Selbstunterricht im Pedalspielen*, mit Musikbeilagen für das Pedal. Offenbach: André, 1834.
5. Becker, Carl Ferdinand, *Ratgeber für Organisten, denen ihr Amt am Herzen liegt*. Leipzig: Schwibbert, 1828.
6. Bönicke, H. *Die Kunst des Orgelspiels*. Leipzig: Brandstetter, 1861.
7. Brandt, August. *Praktische Elementar-Orgelschule*, 1st and 2nd Course. Leipzig: Meuseburger.
8. Brahmig, Jnl. Bernard. *Theoretisch-praktische Orgelenschule*, nebst einer Anleitung im Extemporiren, 3 parts. Leipzig: Meuseburger.
9. Brenner, Friedrich. *Erster Cursus im Orgelspiel*. Eine praktische Elementar-Orgelschule. Offenbach: André.
10. Breyun, B. *Praktische Orgelschule*, Part I. Schwibsch-Gmünd: Schmidt, 1845. (Mehr nicht erschienen?)
11. Buttner, Johann. *Anweisung, wie jeder Organist verschiedene bei der Orgel vorkommende Fehler selbst verbessern kann*. Glogau: Günther, 1827.
12. Burkhardt, Joh. Andreas Chr. *Kurze und gründliche Anleitung zum Orgelspielen*. Urm: Eber, 1829.
13. Davin, C.H.G. *Theoretische-praktische Organisten Schule*, Op. 8. Erfurt: Ktner, 1860.
14. Drechsler, Josef. *Kleine Orgelschule zum Gebrauch bei den öffentlichen Vorlesungen bei St. Anna in Wien*. Wien: Steiner, 1818.
15. Ebeling, E.H. *Die erste Schule des Orgelspiels*, auch eine Schule für das Harmonium. Berlin: Trautwein.
16. Förster, J. *Praktische Anleitung im Orgelspiel*. *Handbuch für angehende Organisten und Lehrer*, Op. 15. Pragae: Veit.
17. _____, *Praktischer Lehrgang im Orgelspiel vom ältesten Anfang bis zur vollkommenen Ausbildung* (*Praktický novod ku hře na vohrný*) 6 fascicles. Prague: Veit.
18. Führer, Robert. *Handbuch für den praktischen Organisten*. Augsburg, 1854.
19. _____, *Praktische Anweisung zum regelmäßigen Erlernen des Pedal-Gebrauchs*. Peggau, 187?
20. Gebhardt, Ludwig Ernst. *Theoretisch-praktische Orgelschule in Übungen nebst Anweisung*. Erfurt, 1837; 2nd rev. ed., Biele: Gebhardt, 187?
21. Geißler, Carl. *Neue praktische Orgelschule für den ersten Anfänger bis zum vollendeten Orgelspieler*. In Verbindung mit Rinck, Hesse, Köhler, Schneider u.A., 12 fascicles. Meissen: Gödsche, 1841.
22. Grotold, J.H. *Die Orgel und deren zweckmäßigen Gebrauch bei dem öffentlichen Gottesdienst*. Ein *Handbuch für angehende Organisten*. Quedlinburg: Becker, 1835.
23. Gregler, F.G.L. *Praktische Orgelschule*, mit *Compositionen* von Bach, F.S. Gregler, Kilmstedt, Kegel u.A., Op. 5, 4 fascicles. Langensalza: Schulbuchhandl. des Thüringer Lehrervereins.
24. Hamillon. *Catechism of the Organ*. London: R. Coates, 1839/1840 (?). 1842? revision: Joseph Wachs.
25. Heinrich, J.A.G. *Musikalisches Hilfsbuch für Prediger, Kantoren und Organisten*. Göttingen: Wenrich, 1833.
26. Henkel, Michael. *Praktische Orgelschule oder 66 Orgelstücke für Anfänger und Schülernskandidaten*, Op. 68. Mainz, 1835.
27. Hering, C.G. *Praktische Profundschule*, oder

28. Die Kunst, das Pedal fertig zu spielen. Leipzig: Fleischer, 1816.

29. Herzog, Johann Georg. Orgelschule. Eine theoretisch-praktische Anleitung zur gründlichen Erlernung des kirchlichen Orgelspiels. Erlangen: Deichert, 1846; 1867; 1890⁶.

30. Hesse, Adolf Friedrich. Nützliche Gabe für Organisten, insbesondere solche, die sich in der Behandlung des Pedals vervollkommen wollen, 2 parts. Breslau: Weinhold, 1831.

31. Hientzsch, Joh. Gottfried. Kurze Darstellung eines methodischen Ganges bei den Pedalübungen (from an unpublished organ method). *Eutonia* IV (1834), p. 24ff; X (1837), p. 148ff. Reply by Scheibe.

32. Hohmann, Ch. H. Praktische Orgelschule, 3 parts. Nürnberg: Schmid, 1859.

33. Kegel, Carl Christian. Orgelschule, zunächst für Organisten in kleinen Städten und auf dem Lande. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1827; 1830².

34. Kindsohn, J. Gottfr., L. Anleitung zum Selbstunterricht im Klavier- und Orgelspielen. Leipzig: Hofmeister, 1817; 1830.²

35. Kriehl, Johann Christian. Der angehende Organist, bestehend in einer gründlichen Anweisung, wie ein Chorbesung mit der Orgel begleitet werden muß, sowohl in Vor- als Zwischenspielen. Erfurt: Bayer & Maring, 1800.

36. Der angehende praktische Organist oder Anweisung zum zweckmäßigsten Gebrauch der Orgel bei Gottesverehrungen, 3 parts. Erfurt: Bayer & Maring, 1801/1803/1808.

37. Kittl, Joh. Fr. Praktische Orgelschule für Paranden. Wien: k.k. Schaubuchverlag.

38. Klipsstein, G.G. Rath- und Hilfsbuch für Organisten und solche, die es werden wollen. Breslau: Max, 1826; 1834².

39. Knecht, Justin Heinrich. Vollständige Orgelschule für Anfänger und Geübtere, 3 parts. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1795-98.

40. Lemmens, Jacques Nicholas. *École d'orgue, basee sur le plain-chant romain*. Brussels, 1862 (First appeared in 1850 in fascioles.)

41. Ludwig, C. Methodik des Unterrichts im Orgelspiel, nach einem neuen, auf die höhere Ausbildung hinarbeitenden Systeme. Nordhausen: Böttching.

42. Martini, [Martin Il Fedesco], i.e., Johann Paul Egide. *École d'orgue, divisée en trois parties*. Paris: Imbault, 1804. A French plagiarist of J.H. Knecht's Vollständige Orgelschule.

43. Meiser, C. Severin. Kleine praktische Vor-schule für angehende Orgelspieler, Op. 5. Mainz: Schott, 1843.

44. Moses, J.G. Handbuch für Orgelspieler, 2 parts. Leipzig, 1787.

45. Müller, Wilhelm Adolf. Die Orgel, ihre Einrichtung und Beschaffenheit, sowohl als das zweckmäßige Spiel derselben. Meissen: Gödsche, 1823; 1830³.

46. Petri, Johann Samuel. Anweisung zum regel-mäßigen und geschmackvollen Orgelspielen. Wien, 1802. (Extracted from his Anweisung zur profanischen Musik, 1767-82).

47. Pitxner, Sebastian. Kann man nicht in 2 oder 3 Monaten die Orgel gut und regelmäßig schla-gen lernen? Landshut, 1789.

48. Rieder, Ambrosius. Anleitung zum Prülldiren auf der Orgel oder der Pianoforte. Wien: Diabelli.

49. Rinck, Jon. Christian Heinrich. Praktische Orgelschule, Op. 55, 6 parts. Bonn: Simrock, 1819-21. *École pratique d'orgue* (French trans.), 1828.

50. Rinck's [sic] Practical School for the Organ, trans. Samuel Wesley. London: R. Cocks, 1835.

51. Rinck's [sic] Organ School, trans. and ed. W.T. Best. London: Novello.

52. [Rinck, Joh. Chr. H.] Vorschule für angehende Organisten, Op. 82. Bonn: Simrock, 1827.

53. Die drei ersten Monate auf der Orgel, Op. 121. Bonn: Simrock, 1838.

54. Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung zum Orgelspielen, Op. 124, 3 parts. Darm-

stadt: Diehl, 1838-41.

55. Ritter, August Gottfried. Die Kunst des Orgelspiels. Ein unentbehrliches Lehr- und Lernbuch für den ersten Anfänger bis zum vollenden Orgelspieler, Part I: Op. 10; Part II: Op. 15; Part III: Op. 24. Erfurt: Köhner, 1844; 1845²; 1846³; 1856⁴; 1877⁵.

56. Rohmann, Heinar Leopold. Kurze Methode zum zweckmäßigen Chordspiel, nebst einer kurzen Anweisung zur guten Erhaltung der Orgel. Hannover: Hahn, 1801. (A plagiarist of Türk's Pflichten.)

57. Sabelon, André. Kleine praktische Orgelschule für diejenigen, welche bei Erlernung der Komposition den Choral zu Grunde legen und sich im Orgelspiel üben wollen. Leipzig: Peters, 1823.

58. Sattler, H. Theoretisch-praktische Orgelschule. Zum Gebrauch in Seminarien, Präparanden-Anstalten, Orgelinstituten, u.s.w. Erfurt: Köhner, 1859.

59. Schneider, Friedrich. Handbuch des Organisten, 4 parts. Leipzig: Hofmeister, 1829/1830. (Part II: Orgelschule.)

60. Theoretical and Practical Instruction for Playing the Organ, trans. Charles Flaxman. London: Novello, 1837.

61. Schneider, Julius. Studien für die Orgel, zur Erlernung des obigen Pedalspiels, Op. 48. Erfurt: Köhner.

62. Schneider, Wilhelm. Musikalisches Hilfsbuch beim Kirchendienst, zunächst für Land-schullehrer, Organisten und Cantoren. Halle: Grunert, 1826.

63. Schönbaldler, E. Prülldirschule. Theoretisch-praktische Anleitung, nach eigener Fantasie re-gelrecht zu spielen. Breslau: Selbstverlag, 1845.

64. Schütze, Fr. Wilhelm. Praktische Orgelschule. Leipzig: Arnold, 1838; rev. ed. 1839; 1897⁶. Handbuch zur praktischen Orgelschule. Leipzig: Arnold, 1839; 1858⁷.

65. Strube, C.H. Theoretisch-praktische Orgelschule. Wolfenbüttel: Hölle, 1849.

66. Töpfer, Joh. Gottlob. Theoretisch-praktische Orgelstenschule. Erfurt: Köhner, 1845.

67. Türk, Daniel Gottlob. Von den wichtigsten Pflichten eines Organisten. Ein Beitrag zur Verbesserung der musikalischen Liturgie. Halle: by the author, 1787. Facsimile reprint. Ed. Bernhard Billster. Hildesheim: Kruf, 1966.

68. Rev. and ed., "with relevant contemporary additions," Joh. Fr. Naue. Halle: Schwetke, 1838 "Concerning the Chief Responsibilities of an Organist," trans. Margot Woolard. Dis-ertation, University of Nebraska, 1987.

69. Vierling, Joh. Gottfr. Versuch einer Anleitung zum Prülldiren. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1794.

70. Vogler, Georg Joseph. Organistenschule mit 90 angeordnetsten schweidischen Chordien. Stockholm, 1797.

71. Volckmar, Wilhelm. Orgelschule. Von den ersten Anfängen bis zur höchstem Ausbildung. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1859-61.

72. Wälden, G. Neue theoretisch-praktische Orgelschule, mit einem Anhang über das Wesen und der Behandlung der Orgel. Augsburg: Böhm, 1848.

73. Waldbor, Matthias. Theoretisch-praktische Klavier-Paritur-Prülldiren- und Orgelschule, 3 parts. Kempten: Ksel, 1825/1826.

74. Wedemann, Wilhelm. Der Lehmeister im Orgelspiel. Erfurt: Köhner, 1847.

75. Werner, Joh. Gottlob. Orgelschule oder An-leitung zum Orgelspielen und zur richtigen Behandlung des Instruments. Meissen, 1805, 1807²; Mainz: Schott, 1825³.

76. Zehner, M., and M. Winkler. Vollständige theoretisch-praktische Generalbass- und Har-monielehre . . . für Orgelschüler, 2 vols. Nordlingen: Beck.

77. Wm. A. Little is professor of German at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. Dr. Little located the "lost" organ works of Mendelssohn and has edited that composer's complete organ works in five volumes for Novello & Co.

1990

THE WORK AND COMPENSATION of MUSICIANS in SACRED MUSIC

by
Dayton Ohio Chapter
American Guild of Organists

- * Job Considerations
- * Interview, Audition
- * Sample Contract

Booklets Available \$4.00 Postpaid

- * Determining Salary
- * Salary Formula & Chart
- * Compute Desired Hourly Rate

Send To: Dayton Chapter, American Guild of Organists
c/o Dorothy McDougall
1101 Chateau Drive
Dayton, Ohio 45429